

Supplementary Appendix

The Origins of Information Processing Preferences in Politics:

Examining Parental Influence

Supplementary Appendix Contents

A	Main Results	3
B	Descriptive Statistics	9
C	Parent-Child Correlations in Prior Political Socialization Research	13
D	Additional Regression Analyses	15
E	Item Wording.....	19
F	Autonomy-Supportive Parenting Scale: PCA.....	22

A Main Results

Table A.1. Comparing Convenience Sample to American National Election Study, Correlations by Dataset (Full samples)

ANES 2000, 2004, 2008 pooled time-series (weighted, all)											
	Pol int	Pol know	Turn- out	Party ID	Party str	Lib- Con	N2E	N4C	Female	White	Edu
Political interest	1.00										
Political knowledge (2000 only)	0.54	1.00									
Turnout (voted dummy)	0.32	0.46	1.00								
Party ID (7-point)	0.04	0.13	0.05	1.00							
Partisan Strength (3-point) Liberal-Conservative (7-point)	0.21	0.21	0.27	-0.06	1.00						
	0.04	0.10	0.05	0.55	0.09	1.00					
Need to Evaluate	0.33	0.28	0.17	0.03	0.09	-0.03	1.00				
Need for Cognition	0.22	0.30	0.14	0.05	0.05	-0.04	0.36	1.00			
Female	-0.17	-0.17	0.01	-0.08	0.06	-0.08	-0.05	-0.16	1.00		
White	0.03	0.14	0.06	0.28	-0.03	0.11	0.06	0.02	0.00	1.00	
Education	0.23	0.46	0.30	0.10	0.09	-0.05	0.20	0.29	-0.02	0.12	1.00
Age	0.26	0.19	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.14	0.00	-0.10	0.01	0.14	-0.07
Convenience Sample (parents and children)											
	Pol int	Pol know	Turn- out	Party ID	Party str	Lib- Con	N2E	N4C	Female	White	Edu
Political interest	1.00										
Political knowledge	0.46	1.00									
Turnout (voted dummy)	0.22	0.23	1.00								
Party ID (7-point)	-0.07	0.05	-0.05	1.00							
Partisan Strength (3-point) Liberal-Conservative (7-point)	0.17	-0.03	0.42	-0.13	1.00						
	-0.06	-0.04	-0.07	0.75	0.08	1.00					
Need to Evaluate	0.22	0.16	0.09	-0.13	-0.03	-0.16	1.00				
Need for Cognition	0.43	0.33	0.05	-0.15	-0.10	-0.20	0.33	1.00			
Female	-0.20	-0.29	0.15	-0.08	0.13	-0.01	-0.08	-0.19	1.00		
White	-0.12	0.07	-0.23	0.19	-0.10	0.07	-0.11	-0.10	-0.07	1.00	
Education	0.09	0.19	0.21	-0.06	0.06	-0.04	-0.26	0.00	0.01	0.11	1.00
Age	-0.11	0.03	0.27	0.03	0.08	0.08	-0.35	-0.12	0.24	0.09	0.54

Table A.2. Parent-Child Correlations

	<i>r</i>
Political preferences	
Political interest	0.21†
Party identification (7-pt)	0.66***
Partisan Strength (3-pt)	0.27*
Ideological self-placement (7-pt)	0.54***
Cognitive styles	
Need to evaluate	0.12
Need for cognition	0.03
Decision strategies	
Confirmatory model	0.23*
Fast and frugal model	0.17
Heuristic-based model	0.07
Rational model	0.07
Information search behavior	
Total unique items opened	0.51***
Total search duration	0.17†
Post-treatment political behavior	
Vote choice	0.33**
Candidate-level affective polarization	0.18

Note: Significance levels denoted by † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$,
 ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table A.3. Parent-Child Associations in Political Preferences, Autonomy-Supportive Parenting as Moderator

	Political Interest		Party Identification	
Parental Model	0.250*	-1.028*	0.630***	-0.11
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	-0.03	-1.228**	0.14	-0.03
Parental Model*Parenting		1.953**		0.766*
Female	-0.211+	-0.262*	-0.130+	-0.12
White	-0.14	-0.204+	0.07	0.11
R ²	0.11	0.19	0.49	0.51
N	77		77	
Interaction test	F(1, 71)=8.06, p< .01		F(1, 71)=4.36, p< .05	
	Partisan Strength		Ideology	
Parental Model	0.235*	-0.46	0.534***	-0.32
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	0.07	-0.258	0.12	-0.29
Parental Model*Parenting		0.766		0.967+
Female	0.05	0.033	-0.10	-0.09
White	-0.19	-0.201+	0.10	0.13
R ²	0.11	0.13	0.34	0.37
N	77		71	
Interaction test	F(1, 71)=1.39, p< .24		F(1, 65)=2.83, p< .10	

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported based on robust standard errors. Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. Interaction test assesses improvement of model fit when including the interaction between autonomy-supportive parenting and parental model of dependent variable, F-test statistic reported. Significance levels denoted by + p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table A.4. Parent-Child Associations in Cognitive Motivations and Decision Strategies, Autonomy-Supportive Parenting as Moderator

	Need to Evaluate		Need for Cognition		Rational Choice Model	
Parental Model	0.12	0.59	0.04	-0.775+	0.094	-0.30
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	-0.05	0.26	-0.109	-0.843+	-0.031	-0.63
Parental Model*Parenting		-0.55		1.175+		0.808
Female	0.09	0.08	0.004	0	-0.176	-0.184+
White	0.03	0.05	-0.035	-0.068	-0.308**	-0.309**
R ²	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.12	0.12
N	77		77		77	
Interaction test	F(1, 71)=0.37, p=.55		F(1, 71)=3.22, p< .10		F(1, 71)=0.24, p=.63	
	Heuristic-Based Model		Confirmatory Model		Fast and Frugal Model	
Parental Model	0.076	0.638	0.231+	0.762	0.162	1.953*
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	-0.057	0.311	-0.002	0.285	-0.019	1.339*
Parental Model*Parenting		-0.623		-0.601		-2.015*
Female	0.145	0.147	0.115	0.119	-0.07	-0.09
White	0.16	0.162	-0.043	-0.042	0.142	0.211+
R ²	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.13
N	77		76		77	
Interaction test	F(1, 71)=0.50, p=.48		F(1, 71)=0.79, p=.38		F(1, 71)=5.63, p<.05	

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported based on robust standard errors. Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. Interaction test assesses improvement of model fit when including the interaction between autonomy-supportive parenting and parental model of dependent variable, F-test statistic reported. Significance levels denoted by + p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table A.5. Parent-Child Associations in Information Search and Political Behavior, Autonomy-Supportive Parenting as Moderator

	Total Unique Items Opened		Total Search Duration (seconds)	
Parental Model	0.517***	-0.359	0.154	0.188
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	-0.072	-0.543	-0.271*	-0.26
Parental Model*Parenting		1.004		-0.035
Female	-0.068	-0.054	0.216+	0.216+
White	-0.169+	-0.183+	0.038	0.039
R ²	0.27	0.28	0.16	0.16
N	77		77	
Interaction test	F(1, 71)=1.96, p=.17		F(1, 71)=0.00, p=.95	
	Candidate Affective Polarization		Candidate Vote Choice	
Parental Model	0.241+	1.255+	0.418**	0.75
Autonomy-Supportive Parenting	-0.091	0.173	0.068	0.238
Parental Model*Parenting		-1.119		-0.361
Female	0.123	0.113	-0.216*	-0.222*
White	0.197+	0.207+	0.044	0.03
R ²	0.09	0.12	0.22	0.22
N	61		61	
Interaction test	F(1, 55)=2.72, p=.10		F(1, 55)=0.25, p=.62	

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported based on robust standard errors. Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. Interaction test assesses improvement of model fit when including the interaction between autonomy-supportive parenting and parental model of dependent variable, F-test statistic reported. Significance levels denoted by + p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Table A.6. Random Parent-Child Associations

	Political Interest		Party Identification		Partisan Strength	
Random Parent Model	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.208+	0.253*
Female		-0.06		-0.429***		0.18
White		-0.05		0.08		-0.10
N	71	70	74	73	74	73
R ²	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.20	0.04	0.11
	Ideology		Need to Evaluate		Need for Cognition	
Random Parent Model	0.15	0.15	0.07	0.09	0.21	0.21
Female		-0.244*		0.03		0.053
White		0.09		0.03		-0.189
N	68	67	74.00	73.00	74	73
R ²	0.02	0.10	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.07
	Rational Choice Model		Heuristic-Based Model		Confirmatory Model	
Random Parent Model	0.185	0.117	0.033	0.038	-0.097	-0.104
Female		-0.043		0.167		0.108
White		-0.244*		0.141		-0.055
N	74	73	74	73	72	71
R ²	0.03	0.08	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03
	Fast and Frugal Model		Total Unique Items Opened		Total Search Duration	
Random Parent Model	-0.135	-0.126	-0.097	-0.098	-0.067	-0.073
Female		-0.022		-0.022		0.179
White		0.12		-0.091		0.077
N	74	73	88	85	88	85
R ²	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0	0.04
	Candidate Vote Choice		Candidate Affective Polarization			
Random Parent Model	-0.07	-0.05	0.173	0.162		
Female		-0.054		-0.032		
White		-0.077		0.12		
N	67	65	67	65		
R ²	0	0.01	0.03	0.05		

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported with robust standard errors. Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. + p<.10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

B Descriptive Statistics

Table B.1. Sample Means of Independent and Dependent Variables (Full Sample)

	Full Sample				
	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Political Interest	178	3.21	0.73	1	4
Party ID	177	2.37	1.99	0	6
Partisan Strength	177	1.83	1.00	0	3
Ideology	169	3.50	1.60	1	7
Need to evaluate	178	4.51	1.18	1	7
Need for cognition	178	4.92	1.12	1.33	7
Confirmatory model	176	3.52	1.27	1	7
Fast and frugal model	178	3.82	1.00	1.33	6.33
Heuristic-based model	178	3.60	1.16	1	6.33
Rational model	178	5.61	0.73	3.50	7
Autonomy-supportive parenting	80	0.64	0.13	0.32	0.93
Total unique items opened	194	57.69	22.72	7	112
Total search duration	194	979.46	688.36	0	4956.93
Candidate vote choice	168	1.57	0.65	1	3
Candidate affective polarization	168	24.74	20.34	0	89

Note: Autonomy-supportive parenting is available for dyads only because it is based on the parent-child average for each item. Those items are transformed to a 0 to 1 scale before combining into a summative scale due to the variation in number of response options across items.

Table B.2. Sample Means by Parent and Child Subsamples

	<u>Parents</u>					
	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	
Political Interest	81	3.12	0.68	1	4	
Party ID	81	2.42	2.13	0	6	
Partisan Strength	81	1.96	0.99	0	3	
Ideology	79	3.65	1.56	1	7	
Need to evaluate	81	4.09	1.14	1.33	7	
Need for cognition	81	4.75	1.12	2	7	
Confirmatory model	81	3.56	1.30	1.33	6.33	
Fast and frugal model	81	3.93	1.06	1.33	6	
Heuristic-based model	81	3.74	1.25	1.33	6.33	
Rational model	81	5.52	0.75	3.5	6.83	
Total unique items opened	95	51.86	21.56	8	105	
Total search duration	95	1008.01	686.88	6.733	3254.05	
Candidate vote choice	79	1.62	0.67	1	3.00	
Candidate affective polarization	79	26.47	21.21	0	89.00	
Female	81	0.67	0.47	0	1	***
White	76	0.66	0.48	0	1	
	<u>Students</u>					
	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	
Political Interest	97	3.28	0.76	1	4	+
Party ID	96	2.32	1.88	0.00	6	
Partisan Strength	96	1.72	1.00	0.00	3	
Ideology	90	3.38	1.64	1	7	
Need to evaluate	97	4.85	1.11	1.00	7	***
Need for cognition	97	5.06	1.11	1	7	+
Confirmatory model	95	3.50	1.25	1	7	
Fast and frugal model	97	3.73	0.94	1.33	6.33	
Heuristic-based model	97	3.48	1.08	1	6.33	
Rational model	97	5.69	0.71	4	7	
Total unique items opened	99	63.27	22.50	7	112	***
Total search duration	99	952.06	692.15	0	4956.93	
Candidate vote choice	89	1.53	0.64	1	3	
Candidate affective polarization	89	23.20	19.54	0	84	
Female	94	0.39	0.49	0	1	
White	93	0.60	0.49	0	1	

Note: Significant differences in means between parents and children are denoted by + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. When there is a significant difference, the indicator is placed next to the group with the higher mean.

Table B.3. Correlations by Dataset and Age

ANES 2000, 2004, 2008 pooled time-series (weighted, 25 and under)											
	Pol int	Pol know	Turn- out	Party ID	Party str	Lib- Con	N2E	N4C	Female	White	Edu
Political interest	1.00										
Political knowledge (2000 only)	0.50	1.00									
Turnout (voted dummy)	0.34	0.40	1.00								
Party ID (7-point)	-0.05	-0.01	0.00	1.00							
Partisan Strength (3-point)	0.22	0.32	0.22	-0.08	1.00						
Liberal-Conservative (7-point)	-0.09	-0.01	-0.04	0.45	0.13	1.00					
Need to Evaluate	0.23	0.01	0.11	-0.10	0.13	-0.09	1.00				
Need for Cognition	0.27	0.31	0.21	0.09	0.17	0.03	0.35	1.00			
Female	-0.15	-0.02	0.02	-0.05	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	-0.14	1.00		
White	-0.05	0.00	-0.03	0.21	-0.02	0.08	0.00	0.04	-0.06	1.00	
Education	0.11	0.35	0.28	0.00	0.11	-0.05	0.11	0.25	-0.01	0.14	1.00
Age	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.06	-0.04	0.10	0.42
Convenience Sample (children only)											
	Pol int	Pol know	Turn- out	Party ID	Party str	Lib- Con	N2E	N4C	Female	White	Edu
Political interest	1.00										
Political knowledge	0.42	1.00									
Turnout (voted dummy)	0.36	0.34	1.00								
Party ID (7-point)	-0.02	0.06	-0.23	1.00							
Partisan Strength (3-point)	0.18	0.03	0.52	-0.13	1.00						
Liberal-Conservative (7-point)	-0.06	-0.10	-0.17	0.78	0.10	1.00					
Need to Evaluate	0.28	0.25	0.30	-0.11	0.16	-0.21	1.00				
Need for Cognition	0.45	0.27	0.10	-0.07	-0.10	-0.25	0.32	1.00			
Female	-0.14	-0.30	0.12	-0.32	0.14	-0.16	0.04	-0.01	1.00		
White	-0.07	0.09	-0.37	0.22	-0.19	0.11	0.05	-0.10	-0.14	1.00	
Education	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	-0.04	-0.08	-0.05	-0.10	-0.13	0.04	-0.04	1.00
Age	-0.09	0.14	-0.17	-0.07	-0.15	-0.15	-0.08	0.24	-0.03	-0.02	0.13
Convenience Sample (parents only)											
	Pol int	Pol know	Turn- out	Party ID	Party str	Lib- Con	N2E	N4C	Female	White	Edu
Political interest	1.00										
Political knowledge	0.52	1.00									
Turnout (voted dummy)	0.13	0.13	1.00								
Party ID (7-point)	-0.14	0.03	0.06	1.00							
Partisan Strength (3-point)	0.19	-0.11	0.28	-0.13	1.00						
Liberal-Conservative (7-point)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	0.73	0.04	1.00					
Need to Evaluate	0.10	0.09	0.03	-0.14	-0.15	-0.05	1.00				
Need for Cognition	0.40	0.42	0.12	-0.22	-0.05	-0.13	0.28	1.00			
Female	-0.22	-0.30	0.02	0.15	0.08	0.13	-0.04	-0.32	1.00		
White	-0.19	0.05	-0.20	0.16	0.00	0.02	-0.27	-0.10	-0.03	1.00	
Education	0.32	0.35	0.13	-0.11	0.03	-0.14	-0.12	0.19	-0.29	0.15	1.00
Age	0.13	0.19	0.24	0.01	-0.05	0.09	-0.17	0.09	-0.14	0.11	0.10

Table B.4. Correlations Between Cognitive Motivations, Decision Strategies, and Politics

	Need to Evaluate	Need for Cognition	Confirm. Model	Fast and Frugal Model	Heuristic-Based Model	Rational Model
Political Interest						
Full sample	0.22**	0.43***	-0.01	-0.17*	-0.16*	0.17*
Parents only	0.10	0.40***	0.01	-0.17	-0.20+	0.08
Children only	0.28**	0.45***	-0.01	-0.15	-0.11	0.22*
Political Identification						
Full sample	-0.13+	-0.15+	0.02	0.01	-0.07	-0.06
Parents only	-0.14	-0.22*	-0.05	-0.03	-0.07	-0.07
Children only	-0.11	-0.07	0.08	0.05	-0.08	-0.03
Partisan Strength						
Full sample	-0.03	-0.10	0.31***	0.06	0.20**	0.08
Parents only	-0.15	-0.05	0.35**	0.15	0.24*	0.01
Children only	0.16	-0.10	0.27**	-0.04	0.13	0.17
Ideology						
Full sample	-0.16*	-0.20**	0.13+	0.05	0.02	0.00
Parents only	-0.05	-0.13	0.09	0.00	-0.02	0.02
Children only	-0.21+	-0.25*	0.17	0.08	0.04	0.01
Candidate Vote Choice						
Full sample	0.05	0.08	-0.25**	0.04	-0.05	0.10
Parents only	0.25*	0.00	-0.33**	-0.09	-0.01	-0.03
Children only	-0.07	0.18	-0.19+	0.16	-0.11	0.24*
Candidate Affective Polarization						
Full sample	0.00	-0.04	-0.08	0.00	-0.09	-0.18*
Parents only	-0.04	-0.10	-0.06	0.19	-0.04	-0.02
Children only	0.10	0.03	-0.10	-0.21+	-0.15	-0.30**

Note: Significance levels are denoted by + p<.10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

C Parent-Child Correlations in Prior Political Socialization Research

Table C.1. Parent-Child Correlations in Political Preferences

Political Items	<u>Convenience Sample</u>	<u>Jennings and Niemi 1974</u>	<u>Jennings, Stoker, and Bowers, 2009</u>				<u>Rapoport 1985</u>
			a	b	c	d	
Party identification (7-pt)	0.66	0.47	0.55	0.47	0.34	0.37	0.58
Partisan strength	0.27						0.25
Presidential vote choice	0.65	0.59	0.58	0.54	0.43	0.33	
Political interest	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.18	0.10	0.15	0.30
Political knowledge	0.40	0.25	0.42	-	0.42	-	
Media							
News consumption	0.17						
Digital literacy	0.05						
Spectator politicization							
Television		0.20					
Magazines		0.15					
Main media		0.13					
Newspapers		0.11					
Radio		0.08					

Note. Niemi and Jennings (1974) defined "spectator politicization" as the "frequency of media usage to follow public affairs and politics." For the Jennings et al. 2009 results, the columns represent the following generational comparisons using the Youth-Parent Socialization Panel Study, 1965-1997: a) 1965 G1-G2 Late Teens, b) 1997 G2-G3 Late Teens, c) G1-G2 1973 Mid-20s Youths, d) 1997 G2-G3 Mid-20s Youths.

Table C.2. Parent-Child Correlations on Political Issues

Convenience Sample	Jennings and Niemi (1974)		Jennings, Stoker, and Bower (2009)					
			G1- G2 1965	G2- G3 1997	G1- G2 1973	G2- G3 1997		
Jobs and living standards	0.41	Integration of schools	0.34	Racial Attitude	0.32	0.20	0.23	0.26
Tax cuts	0.13	Prayer in schools	0.29	Prayer in schools	0.30	0.35	0.26	0.34
Government services	0.58	18-year olds vote	0.13	Business vs. Labor	0.16	0.26	0.17	0.38
Healthcare reform	0.56	Letting Communist hold office	0.13	Tolerance	0.13	0.22	0.16	0.14
Black preferences	0.60	US participation in UN	0.11	Religiosity	0.43	0.62	0.37	0.39
School vouchers	0.20	Allow anti-religious speeches	0.08					
Undocumented immigration	0.33							
Defense spending	0.37							
Diplomacy	0.47							
Troops	0.25							
China coop	0.28							
Abortion	0.38							
Stem cell research	0.23							
Same sex marriage	0.38							
Capital punishment	0.24							

Note. Though not shown, Jennings and Niemi also analyzed parent-child similarity in feeling thermometers towards a number of social groups, which yielded an average correlation of .19.

D Additional Regression Analyses

Table D.1. Partial Correlations for Parent-Child Models (inclusion of autonomy-supportive parenting)

	Partial	Semi-Partial	Semi-partial Corr.^2	Partial Corr. ^2	Signif.	Partial	Semi-Partial	Semi-partial Corr.^2	Partial Corr. ^2	Signif.
	<u>Political Interest</u>					<u>Party Identification</u>				
Parental Model	0.25	0.24	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.65	0.61	0.42	0.37	0.00
Autonomy-Supportive	-0.03	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.19	0.14	0.04	0.02	0.11
Female	-0.22	-0.21	0.05	0.04	0.06	-0.18	-0.13	0.03	0.02	0.14
White	-0.14	-0.13	0.02	0.02	0.23	0.10	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.40
	<u>Partisan Strength</u>					<u>Ideology</u>				
Parental Model	0.24	0.23	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.55	0.53	0.30	0.28	0.00
Autonomy-Supportive	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.52	0.14	0.12	0.02	0.01	0.25
Female	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.66	-0.12	-0.10	0.01	0.01	0.34
White	-0.19	-0.18	0.04	0.03	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.02	0.01	0.32
	<u>Need to Evaluate</u>					<u>Need for Cognition</u>				
Parental Model	0.11	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.33	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.74
Autonomy-Supportive	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.70	-0.11	-0.11	0.01	0.01	0.36
Female	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.98
White	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.79	-0.04	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.77
	<u>Rational Choice Model</u>					<u>Heuristic-Based Model</u>				
Parental Model	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.43	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.52
Autonomy-Supportive	-0.03	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.79	-0.06	-0.06	0.00	0.00	0.63
Female	-0.18	-0.17	0.03	0.03	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.02	0.02	0.22
White	-0.31	-0.30	0.10	0.09	0.01	0.16	0.16	0.03	0.02	0.18
	<u>Confirmatory Model</u>					<u>Fast and Frugal Model</u>				
Parental Model	0.23	0.23	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.16	0.16	0.03	0.02	0.18
Autonomy-Supportive	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.98	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.87
Female	0.12	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.33	-0.07	-0.07	0.01	0.00	0.55
White	-0.04	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.71	0.14	0.14	0.02	0.02	0.22
	<u>Total Unique Items</u>					<u>Total Search Duration</u>				
Parental Model	0.51	0.50	0.26	0.25	0.00	0.16	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.16
Autonomy-Supportive	-0.08	-0.07	0.01	0.01	0.48	-0.28	-0.27	0.08	0.07	0.01
Female	-0.08	-0.07	0.01	0.00	0.51	0.23	0.21	0.05	0.05	0.05
White	-0.19	-0.16	0.04	0.03	0.11	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.73
	<u>Candidate Vote Choice</u>					<u>Candidate Affective Polarization</u>				
Parental Model	0.42	0.41	0.18	0.17	0.00	0.23	0.23	0.06	0.05	0.08
Autonomy-Supportive	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.57	-0.09	-0.09	0.01	0.01	0.49
Female	-0.23	-0.21	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.02	0.01	0.36
White	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.20	0.19	0.04	0.04	0.14

Table D.2. Random Child-Child Associations

	Political Interest		Party Identification		Partisan Strength	
Random Child Model	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.05	-0.06	-0.03
Female		-0.14		-0.310**		0.184+
White		-0.04		0.12		-0.16
N	86	84	88	87	88	87
R ²	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.07
	Ideology		Need to Evaluate		Need for Cognition	
Random Child Model	0.06	0.07	-0.02	-0.01	-0.07	-0.08
Female		-0.13		0.02		-0.028
White		0.03		0.07		-0.033
N	77	76	90.00	88.00	90	88
R ²	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0	0.01
	Rational Choice Model		Heuristic-Based Model		Confirmatory Model	
Random Child Model	-0.097	-0.15	0.097	0.082	0.002	0.013
Female		-0.116		0.176		0.137
White		-0.229*		-0.008		-0.138
N	90	88	90	88	86	84
R ²	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.04	0	0.04
	Fast and Frugal Model		Total Unique Items Opened		Total Search Duration	
Random Child Model	-0.175+	-0.181+	-0.017	-0.018	-0.069	0.004
Female		0.04		-0.01		0.196+
White		-0.002		-0.071		0.086
N	90	88	92	89	92	89
R ²	0.03	0.03	0	0.01	0	0.04
	Candidate Vote Choice		Candidate Affective Polarization			
Random Child Model	-0.07	-0.12	-0.106	-0.123		
Female		-0.094		-0.029		
White		0.01		0.133		
N	74	71	74	71		
R ²	0	0.03	0.01	0.03		

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported with robust standard errors. Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table D.3. Parent-Child Associations, Political Discussion as Moderator

	Political Interest		Party Identification		Partisan Strength	
Parental Model	-0.06	-0.21	0.623***	0.516+	0.234*	0.30
Political Discussion	0.509***	0.18	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.04
Parental Model*Discussion		0.44		0.12		-0.10
Female	-0.14	-0.16	-0.138+	-0.133+	0.04	0.05
White	-0.12	-0.12	0.08	0.08	-0.191+	-0.19
N	77	77	77	77	77	77
R ²	0.28	0.29	0.47	0.47	0.11	0.11
	Ideology		Need to Evaluate		Need for Cognition	
Parental Model	0.540***	0.15	0.07	0.17	-0.10	-0.28
Political Discussion	-0.09	-0.40	0.18	0.31	0.354*	0.057
Parental Model*Discussion		0.53				
Female	-0.12	-0.11	0.12	0.12	0.078	0.071
White	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.04	-0.008	-0.017
N	71	71	77.00	77.00	77	77
R ²	0.34	0.35	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.11
	Rational Choice Model		Heuristic-Based Model		Confirmatory Model	
Parental Model	0.076	0.24	0.052	0.618+	0.233*	0.521
Political Discussion	0.132	0.623	-0.118	0.586	-0.112	0.165
Parental Model*Discussion		-0.529		-0.803+		-0.417
Female	-0.158	-0.143	0.137	0.128	0.104	0.109
White	-0.296**	-0.286*	0.147	0.18	-0.052	-0.062
N	77	77	77	77	76	76
R ²	0.14	0.14	0.06	0.11	0.08	0.09
	Fast and Frugal Model		Total Unique Items Opened		Total Search Duration	
Parental Model	0.13	0.650*	0.513***	1.030**	0.177	0.536*
Political Discussion	-0.138	0.627	0.069	0.556	0.043	0.276
Parental Model*Discussion		-0.837+		-0.733+		-0.446
Female	-0.085	-0.08	-0.056	-0.056	0.238+	0.247*
White	0.127	0.183	-0.16	-0.15	0.046	0.068
N	77	77	77	77	77	77
R ²	0.07	0.12	0.27	0.29	0.09	0.11

Table D.3 continued...

	Candidate Vote		Candidate Affective	
	Choice		Polarization	
Parental Model	0.459**	0.12	0.205	0.602
Political Discussion	0.212+	-0.15	0.108	0.23
Parental Model*Discussion		0.459		-0.45
Female	-0.215*	-0.219*	0.134	0.151
White	0.067	0.07	0.201	0.215+
N	61	61	61	61
R ²	0.25	0.28	0.09	0.11

Note: Standardized OLS coefficients (beta) reported with robust standard errors. As a proxy for political discussion, we averaged parent and child responses ($r=.43$) to the question “How often do you discuss politics with your family and friends [almost every day, 3 or 4 times a week, once or twice a week, less often than that 5 never]?” Parental Model refers to the corresponding parental value for the child's dependent variable. Interaction test assesses improvement of model fit when including the interaction between political discussion and parental model of dependent variable, F-test statistics reported. + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

E Item Wording

Cognitive Motivations

Items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 “Disagree strongly” to 7 “Agree strongly.”

Need to Evaluate

1. I form opinions about everything.
2. I have many more opinions than the average person.
3. I only form strong opinions when I have to. (Reversed)

Need for Cognition

1. I prefer complex to simple problems.
2. I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
3. Thinking is not my idea of fun. (Reversed)

Decision Strategy Scales

All items were rated on 1 “Strongly Disagree” to 7 “Strongly Agree” Likert scales.

Confirmatory Decision Making

1. The most important thing to know when making a tough political decision is what party a candidate belongs to.
2. The parties are so polarized and distinct today that it is hard for me to imagine ever voting for a candidate from another party.
3. I usually see mostly good things about the candidates from my party and many bad things about the candidates from other parties.

Fast and Frugal Decision Making

4. There are only one or two issues I really care about in most elections. I make my decision by comparing the candidates on those one or two issues.
5. Whenever I have to make a tough choice, I focus on the most important aspects of the decision and leave it at that.

Heuristic-Based Decision Making

6. In deciding how to vote, I often follow the recommendations of people or groups I trust.
7. If one option meets my needs, I will save time and go with it without really looking at others.
8. Choosing a familiar candidate is an easy way for me to make a reasonably good vote choice.

Rational Choice

9. When I have an important choice to make, I like to gather as much information as I possibly can.
10. I find it important to carefully consider all likely alternatives whenever I am making a decision.
11. If I learn something about one candidate running for office, I try to find out the same information about other candidates.

Autonomy-Supportive Parenting Items

Our items come from one of the following surveys or scales: Perceptions of Parents Scale (Grolnick, Deci, & Ryan, 1997; see also Niemiec et al., 2006), designed explicitly to capture practices deemed “optimal” in self-determination theory; Supportive Parenting Scale (Simons, Lorenz, Conger, & Wu, 1992); Student Attitudes and Perceptions Survey (Strage, 1998); perceived autonomy-supportive parenting scale (Knafo & Assor, 2007); perceived democratic functioning (Stattin, Persson, Burk, & Kerr, 2011); and parental acceptance/involvement scale (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Bornbusch, 1991).

Questions 1-10 rated on a 7-point (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) Likert scale; Questions 11 and 12 rated on 5-point scale (1=Never, 2=Almost Never, 3=About Half of the Time, 4=About Most of the Time, 5=Always)

PARENT VERSION

Autonomy

Choice

1. I allow my child to decide things for him/herself.
2. I encourage my child to give his/her ideas and opinions even if I might disagree with them.
3. I prefer my child to do things my way.

Say/Perspective-taking

4. I ask my child what he/she thinks before I decide on something in the family.
5. I listen to my child’s side of an argument.
6. My child has influence in the decisions made in my family.

Rationale

7. I seriously answer the questions my child has regarding the principles or behaviors that are important to me.
8. When I make a family decision or set a rule, I explain the reasoning behind that decision or rule to my child.
9. When I ask my child to do something, I explain why.

Direction

10. I expect my child to have a direction for his/her future all figured out already.

Closeness/Warmth

11. How often do you talk to your child about what is going on in his/her life?
12. When your child does something you approve of, how often do you let him/her know you are pleased about it?

CHILD VERSION

Autonomy

Choice

1. My parents allow me to decide things for myself.
2. My parents encourage me to give my ideas and opinions even if we might disagree.
3. My parents try to get me to do things their way.

Say/Perspective-taking

4. My parents ask me what I think before they decide on something in the family.
5. My parents listen to my side of an argument.
6. I have influence in the decisions made in my family.

Rationale

7. My parents try to seriously answer the questions I have regarding the principles or behaviors that are important to them.
8. When my parents make a family decision or set a rule, they explain the reasoning behind that decision or rule.
9. When my parents ask me to do something, they explain why.

Direction

10. My parents expect me to have a direction for my future all figured out already.

Closeness/Warmth

11. How often do your parents talk to you about what is going on in your life?
12. When you do something your parents approve of, how often do they let you know they are pleased about it?

References

- Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalization within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 135-161). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Knafo, A., & Assor, A. (2007). Motivation for agreement with parental values: desirable when autonomous, problematic when controlled. *Motivation and Emotion, 31*(3), 232-245.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*(5), 1049-1065.
- Niemiec, C. P., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., Bernstein, J., Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A self-determination theory perspective on socialization. *Journal of Adolescence, 29*, 761-775.
- Simons, R. L., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, R. D., & Wu, C. (1992). Support from spouse as mediator and moderator of the disruptive influence of economic strain on parenting. *Child Development, 63*, 1282-1301.
- Stattin, H., Persson, S., Burk, W. J., & Kerr, M. (2011). Adolescents' perceptions of the democratic functioning in their families. *European Psychology, 16*(1), 32-42.
- Strage, A. A. (1998). Family context variables and the development of self-regulation in college students. *Adolescence, 33*(129), 17-31.

F *Autonomy-Supportive Parenting Scale: PCA***Table F.1.** Principle-Component Factor Analysis of Parenting Items (n=80)

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1: Allow child to decide for self	0.60	0.38
Item 2: Parents encourage child to give own ideas	0.85	0.11
Item 3: Parents try to get child to things their way (R)	0.50	0.50
Item 4: Parents ask child before deciding on family decision	0.67	-0.07
Item 5: Parents listen to child's side of argument	0.81	0.06
Item 6: Child has influence in family decisions	0.75	0.06
Item 7: Parents seriously answer child's questions	0.61	-0.12
Item 8: Parents explain reasoning behind decisions or rules	0.81	-0.13
Item 9: Parents explain why when ask child to do something	0.75	-0.10
Item 10: Parents expect child to have figured out future direction (R)	0.39	0.62
Item 11: How often parents talk about what's going on in child's life	0.55	-0.55
Item 12: How often parents tell child pleased with their behavior	0.50	-0.61
Eigenvalue	5.29	1.52

(R) indicates that item values were reversed in recoding.